REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-9, 13, 15-16, 18, 20 and 25 are pending as of the date of the Office Action. Claim 13 has been amended.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 13-14, 17-22 and 24-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 13 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 7-9, 13, 18, 20 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Leary (US Patent 5,950,000) in view of Mason (US Patent 6,817,005). Claims 3-6 and 15-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Leary in view of Mason, and further in view of Odaka (U.S. 2003 10140333). Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 recites, in part:

> a tool file ... comprising a custom build rule ... that includes a generalized description of the syntax of a command line that is run when the tool is executed, the generalized description of the syntax of the command line *including at least one tag identifying a dynamic property of a command line switch of the command line*,
>
> a generic property store in the memory that *stores values for the dynamic property* of the command line switch; and
>
> a content handler ... that ... generates from the custom build rule a custom build rule object, the custom build rule object evaluating the dynamic property of the command line switch and *automatically replacing the tag in the generalized description of the command line with one or more values from the generic property store to transform the generalized description of the command line into an executable command line* ....

(claim 1)(emphasis added). Independent claims 13 and 25 recite similar features. At least the highlighted features are neither taught, nor suggested, by O'Leary, Mason or Odaka, alone or in combination.

The Examiner asserts that O'Leary teaches all of the features of independent claims 1, 13 and 25, except the Examiner admits that "O'Leary does not explicitly teach a command line switch of the command line or the dynamic property of the command line switch or one or more command line switch properties associated with the tool." While the applicants certainly agree that O'Leary does not teach command line switches and dynamic properties thereof, much more is missing from O'Leary.

First, on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner continues to assert that the ability for a user of the IPE manager of O'Leary to be able to manually select a filename from a menu and to have that selected filename become a "command line parameter" is similar to what the applicants have claimed. However, there is no disclosure in O'Leary of a "generalized description of the syntax of [a] command line including *at least one tag identifying a dynamic property of a command line switch* of the command line," as claimed. The Examiner seems to suggest that the selected filename itself ("/home/pat/src/app.xd") is the claimed "generalized description." But that analogy does not work. O'Leary explains that the filename is used merely as a "command line parameter." It cannot be both a parameter and a generalized description. Also, the Examiner has not identified "at least one *tag* identifying a dynamic property of a command line switch." Where is the tag? These features simply are missing from O'Leary.

Second, O'Leary does not teach or suggest "a generic property store in the memory that *stores values for the dynamic property* of the command line switch," as claimed. The Examiner asserts that this feature is found in column 6, lines 18-23 of O'Leary with reference to the text ". . . the name of the selected file is broadcast in a message . . . update their picklists . . ." But there is no mention in that portion of O'Leary of a "generic property store that stores values for a dynamic property of a command line switch," as claimed. Rather, O'Leary merely mentions that the name of a selected file is broadcast in a message so that other applications can update some form of "picklist."

Third, because the foregoing features are missing from O'Leary, O'Leary necessarily cannot teach or suggest "automatically replacing the tag in the generalized description of the command line with one or more values from the generic property store to transform the generalized description of the command line into an executable command line ....," as further claimed. Mason does not cure the deficiencies of O'Leary.

The Examiner asserts that Mason teaches "a command line switch of the command line; the dynamic property of the command line switch; and one or more command line switch properties associated with the tool (column 21, lines 12-14)." While Mason does indeed describe a command line switch that has different properties, that is the extent of the description. Like O'Leary, Mason does not teach or suggest "a custom build rule ... that includes a generalized description of the syntax of a command line ... [and] including *at least one tag identifying a dynamic property of a command line switch* of the command line," Mason does not each or suggest "a generic property store ... that stores values for the dynamic property of the command line switch," and Mason does not teach or suggest "automatically replacing the tag in the generalized description of the command line with one or more values from the generic property store to transform the generalized description of the command line into an executable command line ....," as claimed. Indeed, it appears from Mason that a user must manually enter a command line and must manually select any command line switch and any values for that switch. Nothing appears to be automated.

Thus, Mason, like O'Leary, fails to teach or suggest at least the highlighted features above. Nor does Odaka provide any of these missing teachings. Because neither O'Leary, Mason, nor Odaka teaches or suggests the foregoing features of claims 1, 13 and 25, no combination of those references will produce the claimed invention. Claims 1, 13 and 25 patentably define over O'Leary, Mason and Odaka, alone or in combination. Inasmuch as the remaining claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from one of those independent claims, they too are patentable for the same reasons. Reconsideration of the Section 103 rejections of claims 1, 3-9, 13, 15-16, 18, 20 and 25 is therefore respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For all the foregoing reasons, the applicants respectfully submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance.

Date: September 16, 2009   /Steven B. Samuels/
                                                                Steven B. Samuels
                                                                Registration No. 37711

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439